
Memorandum

To:	Department of City Building, Burlington Planning Section	Date:	2018-11-16
From:	Yie Ping See (Turner Fleischer Architects Inc.)	Project Name:	2069-2079 Lakeshore Road & 383-385 Pearl Street
Subject:	Response to Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD) minutes Rezoning Application	Proj. No.:	16.074

The following is in response to Burlington Urban Design Advisory Panel (BUD) minutes dated June 19, 2018.

Question #1: Heritage

1a. Conceal the service access area

Response: The façade of the loading area and stair adjacent the heritage buildings have been designed and recessed to create the visual separation required to allow the heritage buildings to stand out as a predominant feature. With these modifications in conjunction with the material modifications, we believe this comment has been addressed.

1b. Proportions, massing and cladding materials of the podium cohesive and complimentary to the heritage buildings. Podium at rear of heritage buildings is problematic.

Response: The proposal has been comprehensively redesigned in response to the BUD comments. As noted below, the podium design and materials have been revised to create a stronger and enhanced relationship with the heritage buildings. As well, the proportions of the podium have been revised through the introduction of the brick and glass “bays”. With these revisions, as reflected on the submitted architectural plans, these comments from BUD have been satisfied. We welcome the opportunity to discuss the detailed façade design through the course of the SPA process.

Question #2: Podium

2a. Warmer color podium cladding materials

Response: Brick (or brick faced precast concrete) has been introduced as the dominant cladding skin, replacing the precast concrete color as shown in the previous design. This addresses the comments from BUD.

2b. Corner of tower feels heavy while podium feels light. The relationship should be reversed.

Response: The introduction of warm sturdy-looking brick with glass backdrop creates a perception of heavy yet inviting podium. In contrast, light-colored grid frame composed of slender metal or precast concrete on the tower has been introduced to de-emphasize the corner balconies. This modification sufficiently reverses the heavy-light relationship between the podium and the tower. This adequately addresses the BUD comments.

2c. Apply the simple rhythm of podium and proportions of heritage building to tower

Response: The tower façade composition has been dramatically modified to de-emphasize its mass. By removing the top hat detail to the upper floors and balconies. Its composition is in harmony with the heritage buildings, which are highlighted through the recessed proposed building. The technique of using a combination of brick and glass to create “bays”, further disintegrate the mass of the podium, which assist in the attempt to apply similar proportions of the heritage buildings. This adequately addresses the BUD comments.

2d. Be aware that a corner widening at Pearl St. may affect the tightness of the podium at the corner.

Response: The plans as currently constituted address this matter. However, the corner at ground floor may be examined in more detail during the SPA process.

2e. The podium north elevation should relate to the adjacent townhouses. Provide a visual barrier to the proposed parking.

Response: The north elevation is a coordinated continuation of the other three elevations. Overall, the tower has been composed as a unified element to the project. It will continue to be refined throughout the SPA process. However, we are satisfied that this matter has been addressed.

Question #3: Tower

3a. Tower seems to be top-heavy and monolithic. Simplify design and have less cantilevered balconies. Be cautious with the used of bright trendy colors which should be used carefully in smaller design elements that are modifiable.

Response: As noted in response to question #2 above, the tower element has been simplified and unified as one composition in harmony with the heritage buildings. Similar to the podium’s treatment through a combination of brick and glass, the tower uses the light-colored grid frame on window wall with dark-colored spandrel to subdivide the mass. This revision addresses the BUD comments.

3b. There is lack of appropriate setbacks from podium. Tower floorplate is too large and the design should look thinner. A square point tower would appear to be more slender. Emphasize the street corner and its verticality.

Response: The tower floor plate has been reduced from 850m² to 815m². The introduction of light-colored grid frame to the western portion of the short-slab design creates a square point-block appearance, thus providing a more slender visual image in accordance with the intent of the tall building guidelines. This adequately addresses the BUD comments.

3c. The north side of the tower needs extra design attention. Reconsider balcony design to help lighten mass.

Response: The north elevation, as mentioned, has been redesign and is now coordinated with the other three elevations. . It may be refined throughout the SPA process. We believe this adequately addresses the BUD comments.